Maia Lomia

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Nino Tchumburidze

Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics,

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Negation and Conditional-Resultative Hypotactic Constructions in the Kartvelian Languages[1]

ABSTRACT

The negative and affirmative forms create an opposition in which the negative form is marked by various language means, namely, affixes denoting absence, negative particles etc. Based on the empirical material of the Kartvelian languages, the paper analyzes issues of negation with regard to conditional-resultative hypotactic constructions. It is well-known that **condition** is given in the subordinate clause, whereas the **result** is given in the main clause. In the Kartvelian languages conditional-resultative constructions may be affirmative and negative (containing the negative particle); the negative constructions embrace diverse types of context, depending on the function of the negative particle in the construction.

Key words: *Negation, Conditional-Resulative, Hypotactic, Kartvelian Languages.*

Conditional-resultative hypotactic constructions are characterized by numerous peculiarities. One of them is close semantic interrelation between the components, as a result of which the entire sentence is viewed as one conceptual unit. The meaning of the construction is defined by the resultative clause which is conditioned bythe conditional clause. Despite such close link between the components, their semantics should be analyzed separately, taking into

account the fact that each of them may be either affirmative or negative.

Conditional-resultative sentence, like other constructions, is based on the predicates of the main and subordinate clauses. Definition of the mood and tense of these predicates is vital for identifying the final semantics. There are three main moods in the Kartvelian languages: indicative, subjunctive and imperative. In Georgian linguistic literature there are diverse opinions regarding the category of mood and its types (detailed analysis of the issue is given in Shanidze, 1930; Shanidze, 1980; Chikobava, 1950; Chikobava, 1952; Chikobava, 1979; Kvachadze, 1981; Kotinovi, 1959; Papidze, 1979; Papidze, 1984). In some cases, distinguishing of mood as a separate category is dubitable even if the language has organic verb forms expressing condition. Such forms are viewed as a modal forms of the subjunctive mood (for the analysis of the given issue regarding Megrelian material, see Kobalava, 2001; Dadiani, 2005). This opinion is also based on the fact that the subjunctive and the conditional have common semantics of unreality.

Akaki Shanidze was the first scholar who focused on the presence-absence of the predicate with negative particle in the subordinate clause of the conditional-resultative hypotactic construction in Modern Georgian. He also made mention of the semantic differences caused by the presence and absence of the negative particle in the above constructions and distinguished 2 types of contexts in the subordinate clause:

a) Positive:

მე რომ **არ მივშველებოდი,** სულ ლუკმა-ლუკმად დაგლეჯდა.

me rom **ar mivšvelebodi**, sul luḳma-luḳmad dagleǯda.

"If I **hadn'tassisted** him/her, it would have been torn him/her to pieces".

„If the action representing the condition is performed, it should be expressed by the negative verb form" (Shanidze, 1980, 209).

b) Negative:

მე რომ **მივშველებოდი,** ლუკმა-ლუკმად არ დაგლეჯდა.

me rom **mivšvelebodi**, luḳma-luḳmad ar dagleǯda.

"If I **had assisted** him/her, it would not have been torn him/her to pieces".

„If the action is not performed, the verb is given in the affirmative form" (Shanidze, 1980, 209).

The issue discussed by Akaki Shanidze should be further analyzed, new conclusions should be drawn based on the existing ones. Further research should embrace the following issues:

1. The semantic interrelation between the subordinate clause with negative predicate (resp. condition) and the main clause containing the affirmative predicate (resp. result);

2. Definition of the entire semantics of the conditional-resultative construction;

3. Identification of the factors leading to the functional change of the negative particle;

4. Discussion of the linguistic situation regarding the typology of the Kartvelian languages.

Based on the analysis of the empirical material of the Kartvelian languages, 2 additional types of context have been identified in Modern Georgian. All the four types of context, organic for Modern Georgian, have also been found in other Kartvelian languages – Megrelian, Laz and Svan. Research outcomes are reflected in the tables and examples, namely:

The negative particle is used in the **affirmative function** in:

a) *The subordinate clause:* the condition is semantically affirmative, whereas the result is negative (see Examples (1), (2), (3), (4), Table I);

b) *The main clause:* the condition is semantically negative, whereas the result is affirmative (Examples (5), (6), (7), (8), Table II);

c) *Both the main and the subordinate clauses:* semantically, both the condition and the result are affirmative (Examples (9), (10), (11), (12), Table III);

Apart from the above cases, there are situations in which the predicates of both the main and the subordinate clauses are given in the **affirmative form:** the negative particle is absent in such constructions. However, both the condition and the result are of negative semantics (Examples (13), (14), (15), (16), Table IV).

Naturally, conditional-resultative interrelation is given in the verb forms which embrace the categories of tense, aspect and mood (TAM); Out of these categories, **mood** is of special importance for the solution of the given problem. The predicates given in the subjunctive mood represent the action in unreal time. As one of the functions of the subjunctive mood is to denote contrary-to-fact actions, it is possible to use the negative particle in the affirmative semantics and, vice versa, express negation by means of the affirmative form. This language universal is a common Kartvelian phenomenon, found in the literary Georgian as well as other Kartvelian languages – Megrelian, Laz and Svan.

Examples and Tables:

(1) Geo მამაჩემს რომ სახელი **არ აეშენებინა,** მე ავაშენებდი.

mamačems rom saxli **ar aešenebina**, me avašenebdi.

(2) Megr. მუაჩქიმს ცუდე **ვე უგაფუდუკონი,** მა გევოგანდი.

muačkims 'ude **ve ugapuduķoni**, ma gevogandi.

(3) Laz ბაბაჩქიმიქ ოხოი **ვა კიდატუნა,** მა პკიდუპტი.

babačkimik oxoi **va ķidaţuna**, ma pķidupţi.

(4) Svan მიშგუემუ ლახ **მამ ადგämნა** ქორს, მი ხუგამდäს[2].

mišgumu lax **mām adgämna** kors, mi xugamdäs.

"If my father had not built the house, I would have built it".

Table I

The condition formally	The condition semantically	The result formally	The result semantically
არ აეშენებინა ar aešenebina /- "had not built"	ააშენა aašena /+ "he built the house"	ავაშენებდი avašenebdi /+ I would have built	არ ავაშენე ar avašene /- I did not build it
მამაჩემმა ააშენა, მე არ ავაშენე = mamačemma aašena, me ar avašene. "father built the house, I did not build it".			

---

[2]Authors express their gratefulness to associate professor Ketevan Margiani for Svan examples that are given in the article

(5) Geo მამაჩემს რომ სახლი აეშენებინა, მე **არ ავაშენებდი.**

     mamačems rom saxli aešenebina, me **ar avašenebdi**.

(6) Megr. მუაჩქიმს წუდე გეუგაფუდუკონი, მა **ვე ვოგანდი.**

     muačkims 'ude geugapuduķoni, ma **ve vogandi**.

(7) Laz ბაბაჩქიმიქ ოხოი კიდატუნა, მა **ვა პკიდუპტი.**

     babačkimik oxoi ķidaṭuna, ma **va pķidupṭi**.

(8) Svan მიშგუმუ ლახ ჭუადგäმნა ქორს, მი **მäმ ხუგამდäს.**

     mišgumu lax čwadgäma kors, mi **mām xugamdäs**.

        "If father had built the house, I would not have built it"

Table II

The condition formally	Condition semantically	Result formally	Result semantically
აეშენებინა aešenebina /+ father had built it	არ ააშენა ar aašena /– he did not build it	არ ავაშენებდი ar avašenebdi /– I would not have built it	ავაშენე avašene /+ I built it
მამაჩემმა არ ააშენა, მე ავაშენე = mamačemma ar aašena, me avašene. "father did not build the house, I built it".			

(9)　Geo მამაჩემს რომ სახლი **არ აეშენებინა,** მეც **არ ავაშენებდი.**

     mamačems rom saxli **ar aešenebina**, mec **ar avašenebdi**.

(10) Megr. მუაჩქიმს წუდე **ვე უგაფუდუკონი,** მა ხოლო **ვე ვოგანდი.**

     muačkims 'ude **ve ugapuduķoni**, ma xolo **ve vogandi**.

(11) Laz ბაბაჩქიმიქ ოხოი **ვა კიდატუნა,** მანთი **ვა პკიდუპტი.**

     babačkimik oxoi **va ķidaṭuna**, manti **va pķidupṭi**.

(12) Svan მიშგუმუ ლახ **მäმ ადგäმნა** ქორს, მიჯ **მäმ ხუგამდäს.**

     mišgumu lax **mām adgämna** kors, mij **mām xugamdäs**.

     "If father had not built the house, I would not have built it either".

Table III

Condition formally	Condition semantically	Result formally	Result semantically
არ აეშენებინა ar aešenebina/– had not built	ააშენა aašena/+ he built it	არ ავაშენებდი ar avašenebdi /– I would not have built it	ავაშენე avašene /+ I built it
მამაჩემმა ააშენა, მეც ავაშენე = mamačemma aašena, mec avašene. "father built it, and I built it too".			

(13) Geo მამაჩემს რომ სახლი **აეშენებინა**, მეც **ავაშენებდი**.
      mamačems rom saxli **aešenebina**, mec **avašenebdi**.

(14) Megr. მუაჩქიმს ჺუდე **გეუგაფუდუკონი,** მა ხოლო **გევოგანდი**.
      muačkims 'ude **geugapuduķoni**, ma xolo **gevogandi**.

(15) Laz ბაბაჩქიმიქ ოხოი **კიდატუნა**, მანთი **პკიდუპტი**.
      babačkimik oxoi **ķidaţuna**, manti **pķidupţi**.

(16) Svan მიშგუმუ ლახ **ჭუადგÇმნა** ქორს, მიჯ **ჭუხუგამდÇს**.
      mišgumu lax **čwadgäma** kors, mij **čuxugamdäs**.
"If my father had built a house, I would have built it too".

Table IV

Condition formally	Condition semantically	Result formally	Result semantically
აეშენებინა aešenebina /+ had built	არ ააშენა ar aašena /– he did not build it	ავაშენებდი avašenebdi /+ I would have built	არ ავაშენე ar avašene /– I did not build it
მამაჩემმა არ ააშენა, მეც არ ავაშენე = mamačemma ar aašena, mec ar avašene. "father did not build the house, I did not build it either".			

REFERENCES

Chikobava, 1950 — Chikobava A. *General Linguistic Characteristics of the Georgian Language.* Explanatory Dictionary of the Georgian Language, I. Publishing house of Academy of Sciences of Georgian SSR, 1950 (in Georgian);

Chikobava, 1952 — Chikobava A. *Introduction to Linguistics.* Publishing house of Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 1952 (in Georgian);

Chikobava, 1979 — Chikobava A. *Introduction to Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics.* Publishing house of Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 1979 (in Georgian);

Dadiani, 2005 — Dadiani E. *Megrelian Constructions with -კო Formant.* Publishing house of Kutaisi State University, Kutaisi, 2005 (in Georgian);

Kobalava, 2001 — Kobalava I. Subjunctive Moodin Megrelian, ISSUES OF LINGUISTIC, 4. Publishing house of Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 2001, pp. 111-143 (in Georgian);

Kotinovi, 1959 — Kotinovi N. *The Category of Mood in Georgian.* Collection of papers of Telavi Pedagogical Institute, volume 3. 1963, pp. 377- 421 (in Georgian);

Kvachadze, 1981— Kvachadze L. *The Georgian Language,* Part I.: Publishing house "Ganatleba", Tbilisi, 1981 (in Georgian);

Papidze, 1979 — Papidze A. *Subjunctive III in the Contemporary Georgian Language:* Issues of Georgian Speech Culture, II. Publishing house of Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 1979, pp. 54-89 (in Georgian);

Papidze, 1984 — Papidze A. *On the Category of Mood in Contemporary Georgian.* Proceedings of the XLI scientific session of the Institute of Linguistics. Publishing house "Mecniereba", Tbilisi, 1984, pp.14-17 (in Georgian);

Shanidze, 1930 — Shanidze A. *The Grammar of the Georgian Language*, I, Morphology. Publishing house of Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 1930 (in Georgian);

Shanidze, 1980 — Shanidze A. *Basic Grammar of the Georgian Language*, in twelve volumes, v. III.Publishing house of Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 1980 (in Georgian).